State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 23-249

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

October 13, 2023

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge was not fair in her rulings in a juvenile dependency case.

The role of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine whether a judicial officer has engaged in conduct that violates the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct or Article 6.1 of the Arizona Constitution. There must be clear and convincing evidence of such a violation in order for the Commission to take disciplinary action against a judicial officer.

The Commission does not have jurisdiction to overturn, amend, or remand a judicial officer's legal rulings. The Commission reviewed all relevant available information and concluded there was not clear and convincing evidence of ethical misconduct in this matter. The complaint is therefore dismissed pursuant to Commission Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Commission members Barbara Brown and Colleen E. Concannon did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on October 13, 2023.

	•		•••
CONFIDENTIAL		FOR OFFICE US	SE ONLY
Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct	1		
1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229 Phoenix, Arizona 85007		2023-249	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· *		
•			
COMPLAINT AC	GAINST A JUI	DGE	
Name:	Judge's Name:		
Instructions: Use this form or plain paper of the words what you believe the judge did that constitu- names, dates, times, and places that will help t pages may be attached along with copies (not original of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for	same size to f ates judicial mis the commission s) of relevant cou	file a complaint. Desc conduct. Be specific a understand your con	nd list all of th cerns. Additions
In re the Matter of:			
(d.o.b.)			
(d.o.b.)			
The judge stated this case was dumped on her and lawyer whom entered evidence that the safety plan the father of the grandchildren in this case my attorn violations by the paternal grandparents and the fath However, our peices of evidence were never approp We had sufficient evidence to prove the safety violat Judge Throughout the process we we judiciary always seemed under the influence of the o allowed paternal grandparents and father to ma	was being violat ney er. priate as the judi tions were taking are never given defendants party ove the grandch	ed by the paternal gra presented evidence ciary neglected all of t g place and this was ig fairness in the hearing y.	he evidence. gnored by the
Current placement, unfortunately, does not believe problem and blindly support his ongoing denials.	that their son (F	ather) has a substanc	e abuse
Consequently we were denied visits by the judge an with my grandchildren this was unfair practices.	d the judge wou	Ild not even allow a ps	ychologist vistis
We are supportive of reunification, however we were against the dangers and instability of substance abu	e committed to e se.	effectively protect	and
believe we were treatred unfailry in this case placin	ig my grandchild	fren safety at risk.	
Thanks & regards			

· · ·

2